

DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE
Intelligence Information Handling Committee
WASHINGTON, DC 20505

CITE 10
27 JUN 1984
LOGGED

26 June 1984
DCI/ICS 84-4023

MEMORANDUM FOR: David A. Hawkins
HQ DMA(PPL)

STAT FROM: [REDACTED]
Vice Chairman, Intelligence Information Handling Committee

SUBJECT: IC Comments on DMA's Video Disc RFP

1. Attached is the consolidated list of IC comments on DMA's RFP (Statement of Work for Contracting Video Laser Disc Production which you provided me on 13 June 1984). In general, IC respondents thought the RFP was well written, lucidly stated the responsibilities of the contractor and DMA, and made clear what products would be delivered to DMA; only Appendix 1 was incomplete as stated in [REDACTED] cover letter. If, when it is completed, it will include those areas of the world which the IC previously identified to DMA (IHC/MM 84-33; dated 20 March 1984), then the RFP will reflect IC requirements.

STAT

2. Most of the comments included in the attachment are included in an effort to achieve further clarification of areas of possible ambiguity or to correct minor errors in the wording. There are two omissions which are important enough to highlight. Although it may be implied, it should be clearly stated that the contractor is required to handle classified U. S. Government material at the SECRET level and must therefore have appropriately cleared facilities and personnel available to work on the contract. Second, there is also a need to identify, as a deliverable in Appendix 9, the contractor letter to DMA (see paragraph D.1.4) verifying return of all materials to DMA.

3. Furthermore, while it is desirable to include certain encoded data on the video disc itself, I am concerned that the SOW appears to make it an absolute requirement that any bidder must include a proposal for encoding data. This could exclude some otherwise qualified bidders, even though it is an option, which, after due consideration, the government may not choose to exercise. I suggest that all bidders be "requested" rather than "required" to submit such an option and that the evaluation criteria be specified so that an appropriate weight be given to this factor in the event that a bidder submits an acceptable proposal including this option. I am also concerned that some bidders may submit a proposal on this subject which is considered proprietary to the bidder. If this were to be allowed then the government would be faced with either rejecting an otherwise acceptable option or finding itself in the

position of not being able to make a multiple award. From the point of view of both encouraging competition and of achieving production of the desired number of discs in the shortest time possible, it seems that this is undesirable. Therefore, I suggest that the statements of work specify that proprietary proposals are unacceptable and that the government reserves the right to let multiple awards utilizing whatever proposal is submitted and accepted.

4. I am also concerned that, so far as I have been able to ascertain, no one has yet produced video discs orienting each frame to true north. Unless DMA is convinced that this is achievable by an acceptable number of prospective bidders at reasonable cost, it might be preferable to again make this requirement an option which will be given appropriate weight in the evaluation criteria.

STAT 5. Finally, this memorandum shall serve as the IHC agreement that the RFP
STAT reflects IC requirements, presuming of course, that the areas to be imaged are
STAT consistent with those previously identified by the IHC; in this regard, DMA
DMA sent the IHC on 13 June 1984. I trust this is acceptable, as [redacted]
discussed with you on 21 June. Should you have any questions, please call Mr.
[redacted] or myself at [redacted]

STAT Attachment:
IC Comments

ATTACHMENT

Intelligence Community Comments
on
DMA's SOW for Contracting
Video Laser Disc Production

1. 50% overlap in east-west direction is much greater than the IC requirement for at least 25%. Is this not too costly? (See para. B.2.4.)
2. No general statement exists stating the need for appropriately cleared facilities and personnel.
3. The contractor letter to DMA (See para. D.1.4), verifying return of all materials and information used in the production of required video discs, is missing from the list of deliverables in Appendix 9.
4. The terms video laser disc, video disc, and laser disc are used interchangeably throughout the document. This is confusing.
5. In paragraph A.1.3, fifth line, change "Value" to "Valve."
6. The first sentence of paragraph B.1.2 is somewhat ambiguous. May clarify by appending - "Monday through Friday, excluding U. S. Government holidays."
7. The fourth sentence of paragraph B.1.2 is also somewhat ambiguous. Suggest rewriting to - "From the time of receipt of the source material, or no later than 10 working days thereafter, the contractor shall provide in writing to the COTR an evaluation of the condition of the received material and identify any problems which may hinder or prevent imaging of the material supplied."
8. In paragraph B.2.2, subparagraph 2 appears to create ambiguity. Suggest removal of parenthetical expression.
9. Reference paragraphs B.2.10-11. The specification of frame sizes (3"x2.25", 6"x4.5" and 8"x6") has been defined from the perspective of video disc production. For a map with a scale of 1:250,000 these frame sizes equate to viewed areas of 19.2 km x 14.4 km, 38.4 km x 28.8 km and 51.0 km x 38.4 km, respectively. These are odd values to work with and remember. Has any consideration been given to defining the frame sizes from the perspective of the user (viewer) of the video monitor? For example, viewed areas of 20 km x 15 km, 40 km x 30 km, and 50 km x 37.5 km (60 km x 45 km) might give users a better "feel" for distances. These areas would convert to the following frame sizes: 3.13" x 2.35", 6.26" x 4.70" and 7.82" x 5.88" (or 9.20" x 7.05").

10. Suggest the definition of a "scan" be also included in the glossary. (Reference paragraph B.2.3.)
11. Also in paragraph B.2.5, lines 6 and 7 - does this mean that no map edges shall appear in the imaged material? How are edges to be treated with regard to the critical area problem with video images? Also, images taken on the edges of maps with substantial curvature of latitude lines necessarily imply overlap of edges.
12. Should there be a requirement that the lines of constant latitude appear in the same location on adjoining frames located in different scans. If not, this would be disconcerting to users, when panning across frames located in different scans. (Refer to paragraph B.2.7.)
13. In para B.2.11 there appears to have been some miscalculation of the ACCURACY Requirements in mm. Under the Accuracy column suggest that 1.91 mm should be changed to 0.95 mm and 2.54 mm to 1.27 mm.
14. In paragraph B.2.11, in the "NOTE:" portion, why is the required accuracy for fields of view greater than 8" x 6" more stringent than for any other accuracies for other fields of view? For example, if the field of view was constant at 1/2 grid unit, the chart would show -

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 3" x 2.25" | - | 0.0188" |
| 6" x 4.5" | - | 0.0375" |
| 8" x 6" | - | 0.0500" |
| > (8" x 6") | - | > 0.0500" (not the stated 0.025") |
- Suggest this should be restated to make the permissible deviation directly proportional to the size of field of view.
15. In paragraph B.2.12.9, consider changing "Total" to "radical."
16. In paragraph B.2.14.5, fifth line, change "than" to "then."
17. Regarding paragraph B.2.19 - there do not appear to be any standards for this map. Suggest DMA provide the map and this be stated.
18. Regarding paragraph B.2.21 - Does size of type need to be designated?
19. Paragraph B.2.22 can be construed to require that the entire legend must be imaged on a single frame. For some map types, some map legends may be so large that putting them on a single frame in their entirety would produce an unacceptable degradation of their legibility. If so, suggest that it be made clear that in such instances the legend can be imaged on two frames.
20. In paragraph B.3.1, sixth line, should not the "or" be changed to "and"? The previous sentence seems to so indicate.
21. In paragraph B.3.2, tenth line, change "7935.1-S" to "7935, dated 25 February 1983". This is the most current version, per Mr. Al Poulin of Navy (767-3370).
22. Under Task 3 and Appendix 9, there is a need to add as a deliverable, a data base description (in addition to program coding) to support programming systems other than CPM and Pascal.

23. In paragraph B.3.3, fifth line, should not "acceptance" be changed to "acceptability"?

24. In paragraph B.3.5, item 4, should not the VMS operating system be specified? Some VAX 11/780 systems use other operating systems.

25. The "Note:" of paragraph B.3.10 is confusing. Suggest:

| | | | |
|-------------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|
| | Scale \geq | 1:20,000 | 0.1 second |
| 1:20,000 \rightarrow | Scale \geq | 1:400,000 | 1.0 second |
| 1:400,000 \rightarrow | Scale \geq | 1:2,500,000 | 1.0 minute |
| | Scale \leq | 1:2,500,00 | 1.0 degree |

26. In paragraphs B.3.13 and B.3.14, suggest changing "respect" to "effect".

27. In paragraph B.3.17.6, change "o" to "to".

28. In paragraph B.3.18.3, need to better define "between center points" of what?

29. With regard to paragraph B.4.1 - is a frame by frame check required? How many position points are required? What standards apply?

30. Unsure of punctuation in first sentence of paragraph B.5.1.

31. In paragraph B.6.2, line 3, suggest adding "latest and best" before "disc".

32. Glossary of terms - "panned" should follow "overlap." Overlap needs to be more clearly defined, in regard to smaller scale maps where curvilinear latitude lines become very pronounced. "Television field" and "television scan line" definitions should follow "taping".

33. Page numbering, beginning with Appendix 1 and to the end of the RFP, needs to be redone.

34. Appendix 3 - Delete the apostrophe from "GRAPHIC'S" in the next to last line.

35. On the second page of Appendix 5, in fifth line from the bottom, and on page 3 suggest changing "Classification Cards" to "Security Classification Labels" to avoid confusion. Also, change reference to SOW from "B.2.13" to "B.2.14".

36. Appendix 5 - Delete second "sentence" of paragraph 3. Also, in paragraph 4, align the classifications.

37. Appendix 8 - Paragraph 3.B.13 through 16 - How approximate? 10%, 20%, 50%? Paragraph 3.C.3 could be made more specific as to the types of problems which one would expect to be reported here.

38. Appendix 9 - Suggest addition to paragraph 1. Add "They will comply with instructions given in paragraphs B, C, and D of the SOW."

Paragraph 7.C.1 - suggest changing "smooth" to "final".

Suggest adding a paragraph 12 which restates 1st sentence of paragraph D.1.4 on page 25.

39. General Comments and Questions:

- a. Is there a mechanism for previewing edited master video tapes?
- b. Is there a mechanism for design review of programs and implementation of an indexing system?
- c. Would it not be advisable to request the contractor in their response to the RFP to advise DMA of their detailed approach to complying with the SOW?

Distribution/DCI/ICS 84-4023:

Orig-Addressee(David Hawkins HQ DMA(PPL), Bldg 56, US Naval Observatory, Wash DC
20305 STAT

1-IHC/Subject [redacted]

1-IHC/Chrono

1-ICS Registry

STAT

DCI/ICS/IHC [redacted] /hcd/26 Jun84

** Defense Mapping Agency*